

2 0 0 0 - 2 0 0 1

SB

65

School-Based

P u p i l

and

Motivation

Maintenance

P r o g r a m

&

New

School

Application

RUBRICS



WINTER

2000

Table of Contents

| Subjects | Pages |
|---|------------|
| How to use the Rubrics | 3 |
| History of the M&M Application | 4 |
| Recommendations from M&M Evaluations | 5 |
| Steps to a Successful Application | 6 |
| Success Dropout Prevention Strategies | 7-9 |
| Holistic Scoring Rubric | 10 |
| Instructions for Completing the M&M Application | 11 |
| Attendance and Attitude | 12 |
| Coordination and Integration of Categorical Services | 13 |
| Resiliency | 14-16 |
| Student Success/Study Teams | 16-18 |
| Student Learning Levels | 19-24 |
| School Site Council | 24-25 |
| Quality Innovative and Parent Programs | 25-27 |
| Standards-Based School Accountability Summary Form (SBSA) | Appendix A |
| Academic Performance Index Form (API) | Appendix B |

The Purpose for the M&M Rubrics

The Purpose for the M&M Rubrics

This booklet has been developed to help schools prepare the strongest competitive Pupil Motivation and Maintenance Program (M&M) application possible. The competitive application attempts to direct the limited available funding to the schools most committed to implementing the intent of the authorizing legislation (SB 65, Torres, 1985). The California Department of Education (CDE) is given specific authority (Education Code Section 54733) to conduct program quality and fiscal reviews to ensure that funds allocated are expended for purposes intended. Innovations that schools submit provide technical assistance to other schools interested in improving their dropout prevention efforts. In 1989 A.B. 3914 ordered an external evaluation of the effectiveness of the M&M program. The subsequent evaluations of the M&M program have provided the particulars for CDE's direction of the program.

The M&M application attempts to gather dropout prevention effectiveness data from each school. It also encourages schools to do the "self discovery" that is the first step to continuous improvement. By itself, the M&M program is not going to reform the school. But the application does require information and suggest strategies and tools that schools can also use to analyze and improve their reform process improve their performance. For schools in the SB 65 program, these self-evaluative tools are helpful for a continuous cycle of improvement. The elements in the application were crafted with the strong recommendation of state evaluations and thirteen years experience from the most successful M&M program outreach consultants, principals and district coordinators.

Following the recommendations of the second state evaluation, ***Implementing Innovation's*** (SRA Associates, 1992), a competitive application process was instituted to improve the quality of programs. Currently schools are competitively judged every three years (every two years for new M&M programs). Applications are read and scored by trained SB 65 principals, outreach consultants and district coordinators as well as CDE's Educational Options staff. The scoring process involves a holistic reading and scoring by at least four readers independent of each other. Finally the Educational Options staff insure that the demographic and geographic diversity and integrity of the M&M program are retained. Every SB 65 district may submit the names of prospective readers for reading training. Readers from M&M schools must be credentialed and demonstrate a high degree of understanding and experience with the M&M program.

While this booklet is particularly directed to completing the SB 65 M&M program application, it can serve as a roadmap for any school that wishes to develop a strong nurturing safety net for students historically at high risk. Other schools may wish to use it as an on-going learning tool. If you have any questions you may phone your regional M&M field colleague or Marco Orlando (916) 323-2212 for assistance or suggestions.

History of the SB 65 Motivation and Maintenance Application

The Origin of Senate Bill 65:

The Dropout Prevention and Recovery Act (SB 65, Senator Art Torres) was passed by the legislature and signed by the governor in 1985. The bill calls for an expenditure of over 19 million dollars annually to fund three dropout prevention programs that began in the fiscal year 1986-87. The programs included are the: School-Based Pupil Motivation and Maintenance Program (M&M), a K-12 regular school prevention program, the Alternative Education and Work Centers (AEWCs), Educational Clinics and Model Program Replication Grants, a staff development program.

School-Based Pupil Motivation and Maintenance (M&M) Program This program provides about \$51,000 to fund a dropout prevention specialist (Outreach Consultant) at 200 schools funded annually in about 48 school districts. This initiative, now over 13 years in existence, is based in regular K-12 schools. It is an early identification, early prevention schoolwide coordination effort that relies on a catalyst position, the Outreach Consultant, regular use of the Student Study Team process, formal coordination and integration of categorical services, the guidance of a School Site Council, and the institution of resiliency factors to support students in high risk situations.

M&M Funding

The original bill called for 200 M&M schools in 50 four-school clusters. Two elementary schools, a middle school and a high school comprised the initial M&M construct. Initially each school received a \$40,000 grant to hire an outreach consultant as a dropout prevention specialist. Currently the amount will be closer to \$51,000.

AB 3914 - Mandated Independent Evaluation

In 1989 Assembly Bill 3914 required CDE to conduct a three-year independent, statewide evaluation of the M&M program to determine its effectiveness. That evaluation, ***Implementing Innovation*** by SRA Associates in Sebastopol was completed in 1992. It has helped frame the direction of the program since 1992. Among the recommendations of this evaluation were a mandatory annual training conference, strong support for the SST process, active involvement of the School Site Council and a competitive application process.

Competitive Applications

As a result of a protracted budgetary impasse in the summer of 1992, the program was faced with the possibility of having funds cut substantially in the final budget. With the approval of the Deputy Superintendent at CDE, the M&M program initiated a competitive application process and an application ranking system to make sure program funds are available to the programs that are most accountable and faithful to the intent of the original legislation. Since then additional schools have requested funding to establish M&M programs. The lack of additional funding continues to be an obstacle to offering the program to all interested and applicable schools. However with M&M's competitive application, any school meeting the requirements of the initial RFP, may apply. Also additional schools have been funded from savings generated by carryover monies. While the state provides funding for 300 schools, 304-308 actually will operate because of an efficient use of carryover funds.

Evaluation Recommendations

Implementing Innovation, the M&M evaluation, strongly suggests that certain elements of the M&M program are critical for the ultimate success of students at high risk of dropping out of school. The effective presence of these elements obviously occupies a major place in the state's determination of which schools are provided SB 65 M&M funding. The following language of the evaluation suggest which elements make for a strong M&M school program. The evaluation reads:

SSTs: Despite a lack of additional resources to realistically mandate use of SSTs for every at-risk student, schools should be encouraged and provided further training in the use of the SST process...The Department of Education should provide additional technical assistance to schools, and should ensure that schools receiving SB 65 funding have implemented the SST process to the extent of their ability. Schools which fail to conduct in-service training in the SST methodology should be denied funding in subsequent years.

Coordination of Services: The Department of Education must develop clear guidelines on which is meant by school-based coordination, and develop oversight measures to ensure school are in active compliance with existing statute.

Training: As a condition of funding, SB 65 schools must ensure that outreach consultants have attended at least one Annual Conference. New hires who have not attended be required to attend the next session...Principals should also be required to attend the Annual Conference as a precondition to continued receipt of SB 65 grant funds.

Principals at all school levels perceived three dropout prevention strategies as most effective: attendance monitoring, attendance incentives, and early identification of at-risk youth.

*Overall commitment to the program by outreach consultants...
Successful integration of outreach consultants into overall school culture...*

School that have the greatest dropout rate reduction emphasize early identification of at-risk youth,, career awareness and preparation programs, parental involvement and in-service training of school staff on at-risk students...

Dropout Prevention Specialist Training The California Dropout Prevention Network in collaboration with the CDE and two campuses of the California State University system is preparing a coordinated training program for fall 1999, that will teach all the learning developed by the best SB 65 programs and significant reform initiatives in. The courses taught with distance learning technology will allow participants to receive an accredited "Dropout Prevention Specialist" Certificate. SB 65 schools will be provided with the details of this program as soon as negotiations with a California State University campus are completed.

There is no blueprint for a perfect dropout prevention program or school. The most effective program is one that best meets the needs of its particular school population and community. The **M&M Guidelines** are designed to answer questions for persons new to the program as well as those who have been involved in the program for several years. It provides a direction toward performance goals as suggested in the evaluation.

The Steps to a Successful Application

Making an application for an SB 65 School-Based Pupil Motivation and Maintenance grant can be a rewarding and enlightening experience. The application, unlike many grant programs, is not a plan but an “End of the Year Report” that chronicles what the school has done the previous year to create a positive and nurturing safety-net for students generally viewed as at high risk of school failure. First time applicants must complete the same application as current M&M schools.

- 1. Start Now** - Build a box file for the application elements and data requests. Talk to others who have applied before and especially those who have been successful. Look at M&M programs outside the district. Most importantly, start a production plan working back from the due date that will allow you sufficient time to submit by the deadline.
- 2. Read the RFA Carefully** - Use last year's M&M application and rubrics as a model. Before you complete a section, read the rubrics about what the readers will be looking for as a quality program. Do your work on a word processor to amend the application easily. Ask yourself, “How can I prove that statement?” “Is there student evidence I can show?”
- 3. Share the Joy** - Get help! Ask for your principal's support to develop a writing committee. Identify an editor or major writer. Enlist other contributors to the application--have monthly meetings to monitor progress. Critique each other's work--constructively!
- 4. Be Creative** Brainstorm the responses to the elements. What can the school use as an effective example to showcase that the school's work with each element?
- 5. Quantify** - Are you using quantitative data to demonstrate results or accountability for the process? Try to avoid global positive claims that are not substantiated with facts or data. Showcase Results. Document your success--don't give unsupported claims or simply list program names. Be very specific, using appropriate, historical anecdotal illustrative examples of actual student stories, as space permits.
- 5. SST's** -Start collecting at least 35 quality SSTs with follow-ups. Review the scoring criteria in the *Student Success Team Booklet*. Have other ORCs critique your process and summaries. Quantity is important but quality is crucial.
- 6. Learning Findings** Tabulate the learning scores in reading and math for the multi-funded groups at the school (Title I, Special Ed, Bilingual) and compare them to the class as a whole using district or state grade level standards. After determining the percentage of each group at grade level, say how much you'll improve using quantitative language.
- 7. Innovative Programs** Again quantify results about the effect your programs have had. Substantiate claims. Be specific--use anecdotes when appropriate.
- 8. School Goals** Be specific and quantitative about your progress or lack of progress in the areas of attendance, attitude and achievement.
- 9. Attend the Scoring Training** Learn how we score. Have others read your work and check it against the Rubrics.
- 10. Send it in Anyhow!** Regardless of how good you feel it is. Every application will be scored and given feedback; that will help your school's program.

SUCCESSFUL SB 65 M&M SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES

The current Motivation and Maintenance program continues to support the most effective school reform research available. There is a significant similarity among these studies about what supports improvement in low performing schools. Effective school research, the Restructuring program, Resiliency literature, the findings from California's "Healthy Start" program are consistent SB 65's themes. The following suggestions should be helpful in preparing a school to improve its services to students at high risk of school failure.

Step 1: DEFINE STUDENT OUTCOMES AND SCHOOL GOALS

Identify the dropout indicators you wish to effect. The M&M program suggests a focus on the 3 A's: Attendance, Attitude (student behavior), and Achievement. Research baseline data, set goals, propose a strategy, agree on an assessment process, set benchmarks times and levels of progress, accumulate outcome indicators, learning artifacts, i.e., the evidences that the goals have been met, a final review and new goal setting. This process is employed by almost all school improvement processes and is known by many names, Cycle of Inquiry, Continuous Improvement .

Step 2: SET HIGH STANDARDS FOR STUDENTS AND STAFF

Accomplishing great things begins with a belief system. Believing that all students at the school will reach state and national learning standards, high rates of student attendance, and high student behavior performance norms is critical for all. Setting standards is the very first step to the following improvement goal setting efforts.

1. Academic Cycle of Improvement
2. Staff Development Goals
3. School Climate/School Culture goals

Step 3: COORDINATE AND INTEGRATE SERVICES

All M&M schools are school-based programs and are required to coordinate their state funded services. Federal funds may be coordinated by becoming a Title I Schoolwide Project. M&M schools are encouraged to merge services for their categorically funded clients, many of whom are clients for more than one funding source. This coordination takes the form of formal meetings to address the common needs of clients and identify support services inside and outside the school.

In short, the school identifies its resources, establishes a formal meeting schedule, prioritizes client's needs and serves as the school's "service triage" for children and their families.

Step 4: STRENGTHEN THE STUDENT /SUCCESS STUDY TEAM PROCESS

The SST process is the chief early identification and intervention tool for M&M schools. Its effectiveness has been established and SST training been continuously provided. Schools applying for SB 65 funding should examine the state process carefully before submitting SST protocols or summaries for scoring. In the application should will be asked to:

1. List the number of complete Student Study Team Meetings
2. List the number of follow-up meetings for the SSTs
3. Comply with the rubrics or SB 65 SST Manual

Step 5: INSTITUTE RESILIENCY FACTORS

The resiliency research provides the strongest substantiation that the SB 65 formula works with students and families in distress. It calls for identifying and meeting student needs, following accepted child development norms as a basis for service delivery, individuation in providing services, monitoring and “continuity of care over time”. The following strategies, program elements and student services are significant factors in building up the resiliency of students in at-risk circumstances. Schools seeking academic improvement for its most demanding students will be well advised to institutionalize these elements.

1. **Encourage Pro-Social Bonding** Increase bonds of connectedness between family members, between school and student, and between student and other positive, pro-social bonding groups or activities.
2. **Teaching “Life Skills”** Provide formal instruction for refusal skills, assertiveness, healthy conflict resolution, decision-making, and stress management, how to make friends, how to find and interview for a job, and the qualities of a good employee are consistently taught to students in a format that emphasizes role playing and relevance to “real life” situations.
3. **Establish Clear, Consistent Boundaries** The school should enunciate clear, firm policies, that address student behaviors and consistently enforce it.
4. **Provide Avenues for Caring and Support** Ensure that all children have some caring, support, and positive recognition by providing school incentive programs, and mentorships, investigate community support groups that can provide unconditional caring, listening, encouragement and support for individuals at high risk of failure.
5. **Support High Expectations** Provide all children with high expectations for success, and ensure that all the adults at the school share a belief that all students can succeed. This belief should be communicated clearly, strongly and frequently.
6. **Provide Opportunities for Meaningful Student Participation** The school can create success by developing student programs which emphasize service to other students, the school, and the community. Examples of student participation are cross-age tutoring, support groups, service clubs or organization that foster service learning projects and community service at the school.

Step 6 : EXAMINE AND COMPARE STUDENT LEARNING LEVELS

M&M schools collect learning assessment data from the state accepted standardized test (SAT 9), local or state standards and other performance indicators to compare the performance of multifunded student populations (e.g., Title I, LEP, or Special Education) with regular students. This “multiple measure” approach establishes a method to determine how many of the categorically supported students meet grade level standards. This only the first step. The next important task is devising strategies to systemically increase the number of grade level performers. Schools will be judged both on their process as well as their efforts.

Step 7: PROVIDE FOR AN INFORMED AND DECISIVE SCHOOL SITE

. All school based programs, like SB 65, have provisions for parent and staff involvement in the planning and decision making of state categorical programs. The most successful schools include active parental involvement and staff commitment. Federal programs also require parent approvals, and support active, informed parents as partners in decision-making roles. The M&M evaluation has validated the wisdom of this requirement.

Step 8: SET AND MONITOR QUANTITATIVE SCHOOL GOALS

Among the universally accepted axioms for any school improvement process is the assessment, especially on-going assessment. Schools that devote time and energy to monitoring success in the academic work of their students and the effectiveness of their programs strongly agree. Evidence of a strong and routine assessment strategies always precede success. The readers of M&M competitive applications look for a commitment to assessment as a commitment to accountability.

Holistic Scoring Rubric

Each school applications will receive an overall score that reflects the strength of its submission. Scorers will make a judgment based on this rubric for the application and the extent to which critical elements of each element are present.

H-4 The School Makes a Compelling Case (a) All elements of this application are present with explicit evidence of success. (b) The application represents an exceptional school effort in its integration of services. (c) The school engages in a continuous review of its educational programs/services and can demonstrate learning growth to multi-funded students. (d) At least exemplary 35 Student Study Teams and follow-up meetings were submitted; most show student improvement. (e) Parents and staff members are actively involved and empowered in School Site Council deliberations and decisions. (f) There is very convincing evidence presented that the school's resiliency factors have improved student lives. (g) The school has created innovative programs and services at the school for the multifunded students and their families in a documented success.

H-3 The School Makes a Strong Case (a) All elements of this application are adequately addressed explicitly or implicitly; it represents a strong school effort to meet the needs of high risk pupils. (b) Regular meetings are held to coordinate categorical services and personnel. (c) The school engages in a continuous review of its educational programs and services to multifunded students and monitors learning growth. (d) At least 30 Student Study Teams and follow-up meetings are submitted; they show a strong school commitment and some student success. (e) 4 School Site Council meetings show active staff and parent decision-making. (f) The school has instituted strong resiliency programs/services to address at-risk student needs. (g) There are innovative programs and services at the school for special needs of the multifunded students and their families.

H-2 The School Makes a Sufficient Case (a) There is little evidence presented that the school has addressed the elements of this application in an effective fashion, but efforts of the school are clear. (b) The school does provide some evidence of service coordination to meet the needs of high risk pupils, but there are few formal meetings. (c) The school has mandated testing for students; it may not monitor academic growth of multifunded students. (d) The school completes at least 25 SST meetings, some with follow-ups. (e) School Site Council meetings are held with limited staff and parent decision-making. (f) The school has instituted some resiliency programs/services. (g) Innovative programs and services are planned for the special needs of at-risk students and their families.

H-1 The School Makes a Severely Limited Case (a) There is no evidence presented that the school has addressed the elements of this application in an adequate fashion, or the school's efforts are not clearly presented. (b) The school provides no evidence of program or service coordination. (c) There is little evidence that student learning is monitored for multifunded students. (d) The school completes less than 20 SST meetings, few with follow-ups. (e) 4 School Site Council meetings are not held or there is very limited staff and parent decision-making (f) No special school programs or services have been instituted to ensure at-risk student resiliency or success. (g) No Innovative programs/services are planned for special needs of at-risk students and their families. 10

Instructions for Completing the M&M Application

In the 1998-99 M&M End of the Year report SB 65 M&M schools provide evidence about implementing the SB 65 School-Based Pupil Motivation and Maintenance Program. Some of the information provided will help the state establish a database for program reviews, legislative inquiries and other analyses. This information will assist the application readers and scorer in assessing the effectiveness of the school given its demographics, enrollment, ethnicity, amounts of categorical and other funding, transiency rate and other critical elements.

This booklet was established initially as a training tool for the readers and scorers of the competitive application. The suggestion was made to distribute it with the application so that especially first-time application preparers would understand how the application was going to be evaluated. The Educational Options Office in Sacramento has added some explanatory material to make it even more helpful.

| Page | Program Element |
|------|-----------------|
|------|-----------------|

- | | |
|----------|--|
| 2 | Board Assurances This is a list of each district's M&M schools. The local school board assures the state these schools will use M&M funds for the purposes of the M&M grant. They agree to return those funds if M&M funds are misused. |
| 3 | School Site Council Assurances The local SSC has jurisdiction over the SB 65 M&M program by education code. They are responsible for all school-based coordinated programs and must approve the school's plan for service to the school's "multi-funded" groups. The SSC composition is very important because it assures equity and a balance of power among parents, teachers, administrators and in secondary schools, the students themselves. Lack of equity or balance will result in a non-compliant penalty. |
| 4 | School Budget Almost all of the funds provided in the M&M program grant are for the employment and support of the outreach consultant. On this page the school assures the state the funding will be used appropriately. It must be approved by the SSC. The SSC chairperson signs it signifying that the entire SSC has approved the budget. |
| 5 | Personnel List To guarantee that our office knows who the responsible parties at the school and district, we ask for an annual personnel list. |
| 6 | Expenditure Report This explanation of how M&M funds were expended the previous year must be sent in, indicating if carryover exists and how it was used. It is due July 31 each year. |
| 7 | Data Collection The M&M program grants are given to improve the school lives of targeted students at high risk of failing. Traditionally the state has provided extra support to schools that have large numbers of children in these "categories", hence the term "categorical" funds. Since these children also receive support from the regular school program and the categorical funds, they are called "multi-funded" (e.g., Title I, Special Education, English Language Learners, GATE). As an accountability measure and to prove the value of these extra "categorical" funding and services, the M&M application collects and reports learning data from multi-funded student populations. |

Instructions for Completing M&M Application

| Page | Program Element |
|------|---|
| 7 | <p>Data Collection This year two reporting forms will be required. The first is the Standards-Based School Achievement Summary and the second is the Academic Performance Index reporting form. Schools may acquire a copy of this information from the SAT 9 results and the published API results for the school. This information should be retained at your school after submission of this report as it will serve as baseline data for future reports or in the event it is lost in the mail.</p> <p>Section II: Program Information</p> <p><u>Enrollment:</u> We wish to know the total number of students enrolled at your school during the years and indicated the type of school you have. <u>Ethnicity:</u> We want to know the <u>percentages</u> for each group represented at your school population (e.g., 52.5%) and not the number of children in each ethnic group.</p> |
| 8 | <p>Attendance, Attitude Student attendance and attitude data is a very important part of the determination the state must make of school effectiveness. Each of the elements in the End-of-the-Year report will receive a holistic score. In the following pages you see the readers' scoring comments on a 1 (low) to 4 (high) scale. The Code for Attendance is A; that for Student Attitude is "SA".</p> <p>A. Attendance (Scoring 4= Highest; 1=Lowest) (a) The school's report on student attendance shows an aggressive attendance improvement effort that is positive (incentives for good attendance predominate over negative consequences for poor attendance) and effective (attendance rates are showing marked improvement compared to the two previous years). (b) Attendance goals were made to improve attendance and these goals were monitored throughout the year. (c) The school used innovative procedures, positive incentives, home contacts etc. that employed teachers, administrative staff and attendance workers. (d) The school clearly promulgated a student attendance policy that set a high level of expectations for student attendance. (e) Student truancy is addressed in an immediate, fair, and consistent manner. (f) Serious truants were monitored and counseled into preventive remediation programs as well as given the negative consequences according to the discipline code.</p> <p>SA. Student Attitude (Scoring 4= Highest; 1=Lowest) a) The school's report on student behavior shows a proactive student behavior improvement effort that is positive (rewards for good behavior predominate over negative consequences for poor behavior) and effective, (suspension and expulsion rates are declining compared to the two previous years). (b) Student behavior goals were planned in the beginning of the year and were consistently monitored throughout the year. (c) The school used early intervention, positive incentives, home contacts etc., employed teachers, administrative staff and clerical staff in a schoolwide effort. (d) The school clearly promulgated student norms that set high levels of expectations for student behavior. (e) Student transgressions were addressed in an immediate, fair, and consistent manner. (f) Serious transgressors were counseled into preventive remediation programs as well as assigned the negative consequences of the discipline code.</p> |

Instructions for Completing the M&M Application

| Page | Program Element |
|--|-----------------|
| <p>1 1 COORDINATION AND INTEGRATION OF CATEGORICAL SERVICES Schools should be using state and federal programs/personnel services and funding, in a collaborative, integrated and coordinated fashion to meet the needs of their students and their families. This element measures how effectively the school identifies needs, meets those needs and follows through with support. A formal “Triage team” meets regularly, focus in on actual student needs, craft solutions, referrals, provide resources and assign a case carrier to track the effort. This item will be scored by both the process employed as well as student performance indicators.</p> <p>CS-4. The School Makes a Compelling Case: (a) All service personnel paid for by state and federal categorical funds regularly attend Coordinating Team meetings. (b) Well-planned, formal, regularly scheduled meetings coordinated and integrated their services to meet the needs of multi-funded students. (c) The school provided extensive sharing of personnel, services and resources to meet the needs of multi-funded students. (d) The school can point to specific student improvement and has tracked the success of the school’s efforts.</p> <p>CS-3. The School Makes a Strong Case: (a) Most of the service personnel paid for by state and federal categorical funds attend coordination meetings. (b) Much of the formal, regularly scheduled meetings’ time is spent discussing the needs and solutions for multi-funded students. (c) The school did considerable sharing of personnel, services and resources to meet the needs of multi-funded students. (d) The school provided evidence of effective coordination and tracking in the delivery of services, if not actual student improvement.</p> <p>CS-2. The School Makes a Sufficient Case: (a) Some of the service personnel paid for by state and federal categorical funds attend coordination meetings. (b) Some of the formal meeting time is used to discuss needs of multi-funded students. (c) The school provides some sharing of personnel/services and resources to address the needs of multi-funded students. (d) The school demonstrates some collaboration in the delivery of services, it offers no evidence of follow-up tracking or actual student improvement.</p> <p>CS-1. The School Makes a Seriously Limited Case: (a) Few service personnel paid for by state and federal categorical funds attend coordination meetings. (b) There is no evidence of formal, regular meetings. (c) The school provides little or no sharing of personnel/services and resources to meet needs of multi-funded students. (d) The school cannot demonstrate any collaboration in the delivery of services, and offers no evidence of school efforts to follow-up on identification of students’ needs that resulted in student improvement.</p> | |

1 1 COORDINATION AND INTEGRATION OF CATEGORICAL SERVICES

Schools should be using state and federal programs/personnel services and funding, in a collaborative, integrated and coordinated fashion to meet the needs of their students and their families. This element measures how effectively the school identifies needs, meets those needs and follows through with support. A formal “Triage team” meets regularly, focus in on actual student needs, craft solutions, referrals, provide resources and assign a case carrier to track the effort. This item will be scored by both the process employed as well as student performance indicators.

CS-4. The School Makes a Compelling Case: (a) All service personnel paid for by state and federal categorical funds regularly attend Coordinating Team meetings. (b) Well-planned, formal, regularly scheduled meetings coordinated and integrated their services to meet the needs of multi-funded students. (c) The school provided extensive sharing of personnel, services and resources to meet the needs of multi-funded students. (d) The school can point to specific student improvement and has tracked the success of the school’s efforts.

CS-3. The School Makes a Strong Case: (a) Most of the service personnel paid for by state and federal categorical funds attend coordination meetings. (b) Much of the formal, regularly scheduled meetings’ time is spent discussing the needs and solutions for multi-funded students. (c) The school did considerable sharing of personnel, services and resources to meet the needs of multi-funded students. (d) The school provided evidence of effective coordination and tracking in the delivery of services, if not actual student improvement.

CS-2. The School Makes a Sufficient Case: (a) Some of the service personnel paid for by state and federal categorical funds attend coordination meetings. (b) Some of the formal meeting time is used to discuss needs of multi-funded students. (c) The school provides some sharing of personnel/services and resources to address the needs of multi-funded students. (d) The school demonstrates some collaboration in the delivery of services, it offers no evidence of follow-up tracking or actual student improvement.

CS-1. The School Makes a Seriously Limited Case: (a) Few service personnel paid for by state and federal categorical funds attend coordination meetings. (b) There is no evidence of formal, regular meetings. (c) The school provides little or no sharing of personnel/services and resources to meet needs of multi-funded students. (d) The school cannot demonstrate any collaboration in the delivery of services, and offers no evidence of school efforts to follow-up on identification of students’ needs that resulted in student improvement.

Instructions for Completing the M&M Application

Page

Program Element

1 1 Scoring Questions for Coordination of Services

1. Formal Meetings. Is there evidence of regular meetings of all state and federal categorical programs, plus personnel from other programs at the school?

Do these categorically funded personnel have a set time to meet on a regular basis?

Is there evidence that multi-funded students and their needs is the primary area of discussion at these meetings?

Are there records kept of the discussions in these meetings (i.e., agendas or minutes)?

Are results reported to the principal, teachers or other groups at the school? Were they included in the M&M application?

2. Those attending meetings:

Is there a list of the names of those people funded and their funding source?

3. Categorical programs at the school:

Is there a list of all categorical programs at the school?

Are the dollar amounts of all categorical programs listed?

4. Categorical coordinated programs:

Is there a list of federal and/or state categorical programs coordinated by the school?

5. Description of the integration and the coordination

Is there an adequate, realistic coordinated, integrated service effort?

Does the description identify a high quantifiable level of student performance?

Is there measurable evidence that positive results occurred as a direct consequence of the coordinated school effort?

14-15 Section IV: RESILIENCY FACTORS AND ASSET DEVELOPMENT:

Developmental assets are the building blocks for positive human development. Internal and External Assets identified by the Search Institute of Minneapolis, Mn* are positive relationships and experiences that nurture and condition young people's emerging psyches.

External Assets

SUPPORT

1. Family support
2. Positive family communication
3. Other adult relationships
4. Caring neighborhood
5. Caring school climate
6. Parent involvement in schooling

EMPOWERMENT

7. Community Values youth
8. Youth as resources
9. Service to others
10. Safety

Instructions for Completing the M&M Application

Page

Program Element

14-15 Section IV: RESILIENCY FACTORS AND ASSET DEVELOPMENT:

External Assets

BOUNDARIES AND EXPECTATIONS

- 11. Family boundaries
- 12. School boundaries
- 13. Neighborhood boundaries
- 14. Adult Role Models
- 15. Positive Peer Influence
- 16. High Expectations

CONSTRUCTIVE USE OF TIME

- 17. Creative Activities
- 18. Youth Programs
- 19. Religious Community
- 20. Time at home

Internal Assets

COMMITMENT TO LEARNING

- 21. Achievement Motivation
- 22. School engagement
- 23. Homework
- 24. Bonding to school
- 25. Reading for pleasure

POSITIVE VALUES

- 26. Caring
- 27. Equality and social justice
- 28. Integrity
- 29. Honesty
- 30. Responsibility
- 31. Restraint

SOCIAL COMPETENCIES

- 32. Planning and decision-making
- 33. Interpersonal competence
- 34. Cultural competence
- 35. Resistance skills
- 36. Peaceful conflict resolution

POSITIVE IDENTITY

- 37. Personal Power
- 38. Self-esteem
- 39. Sense of purpose
- 40. Positive view of personal future

Student who have developmental assets in their lives have proven to perform better at school and are more resistant to drugs, alcohol, violent behavior and premature sexual experimentation. Schools that institutionalize strategies that foster these assets and other resiliency factors have the greatest chance of impacting the lives of students in high risk of failing. The effectiveness of those resiliency factors can best be shown by student performance indicators.

*For further explanation of the Forty Developmental Assets you may contact **Search Institute**, 700 S. Third Street, Suite 210, Minneapolis, MN 55415 (800) 888-7828; website www.search-institute.org.

Instructions for Completing the M&M Application

| Page | Program Element |
|-------|---|
| 14-15 | <p>Section IV: RESILIENCY FACTORS AND ASSET DEVELOPMENT:</p> <p>R-4. The School Makes a Compelling Case. (a) All six resiliency factors are addressed in a thoughtful, in-depth, manner. (b) The school is routinely engaging parents, students, and staff in the life skills, bonds of connectedness, with a excellent description of specific programs or strategies. (c) The norms, activities, programs, and policies of the school demonstrate a caring community for students. (d) All students are taught ongoing life skills through special focus on these areas. (e) The school has provided many adult school partners or mentors who have increased success levels of students. (f) There is good evidence that students give back to the community through service learning and community service.</p> <p>R-3. The School Makes a Strong Case. (a) All six resiliency factors are addressed in a in-depth manner. (b) The school is engaging parents, students, and staff in life skills, bonds of connectedness, student caring and support areas with a clear description of specific programs or strategies. (c) The activities/programs and policies create a caring community for students. (d) Students are taught life skills through activities and programs. (e) The school has provided adult school partners or mentors who work with students. (f) Students are encouraged to give back to the community through service learning and community service.</p> <p>R-2. The School Makes a Sufficient Case. (a) Most of the resiliency factors are specifically referenced by programs present at the school. (b) The school reports in general terms about efforts made in the life skills, bonds of connectedness, student caring and support areas with a limited description of specific programs or strategies. (c) There are some activities/programs that create a caring community for students. (d) There is some mention but no evidence presented that the school teaches life skills through activities and programs. (e) The school has planned mentors or adult school partners (f) There are some opportunities for students to get involved in community service or service learning.</p> <p>R-1. The School Makes a Seriously Limited Case (a) Few resiliency factors are referenced by specific programs at the school. (b) The report of the school's efforts is very vague about efforts made in the life skills, bonds of connectedness, student caring and support. (c) There is limited mention of any specific programs or strategies. (d) There is no mention or evidence presented that the school teaches life skills through activities and programs. (e) There is little mention and no evidence that the school has adult school partners who work with students. (f) There are few opportunities for student participation in the service clubs or community service.</p> |

14-15 Section IV: RESILIENCY FACTORS AND ASSET DEVELOPMENT:

R-4. The School Makes a Compelling Case. (a) All six resiliency factors are addressed in a thoughtful, in-depth, manner. (b) The school is routinely engaging parents, students, and staff in the life skills, bonds of connectedness, with a excellent description of specific programs or strategies. (c) The norms, activities, programs, and policies of the school demonstrate a caring community for students. (d) All students are taught ongoing life skills through special focus on these areas. (e) The school has provided many adult school partners or mentors who have increased success levels of students. (f) There is good evidence that students give back to the community through service learning and community service.

R-3. The School Makes a Strong Case. (a) All six resiliency factors are addressed in a in-depth manner. (b) The school is engaging parents, students, and staff in life skills, bonds of connectedness, student caring and support areas with a clear description of specific programs or strategies. (c) The activities/programs and policies create a caring community for students. (d) Students are taught life skills through activities and programs. (e) The school has provided adult school partners or mentors who work with students. (f) Students are encouraged to give back to the community through service learning and community service.

R-2. The School Makes a Sufficient Case. (a) Most of the resiliency factors are specifically referenced by programs present at the school. (b) The school reports in general terms about efforts made in the life skills, bonds of connectedness, student caring and support areas with a limited description of specific programs or strategies. (c) There are some activities/programs that create a caring community for students. (d) There is some mention but no evidence presented that the school teaches life skills through activities and programs. (e) The school has planned mentors or adult school partners (f) There are some opportunities for students to get involved in community service or service learning.

R-1. The School Makes a Seriously Limited Case (a) Few resiliency factors are referenced by specific programs at the school. (b) The report of the school's efforts is very vague about efforts made in the life skills, bonds of connectedness, student caring and support. (c) There is limited mention of any specific programs or strategies. (d) There is no mention or evidence presented that the school teaches life skills through activities and programs. (e) There is little mention and no evidence that the school has adult school partners who work with students. (f) There are few opportunities for student participation in the service clubs or community service.

Instructions for Completing the M&M Application

Page

Program Element

14-15 Section IV: RESILIENCY FACTORS AND ASSET DEVELOPMENT: Critical Elements

1. Is there evidence that the school routinely engages parents and staff in meaningful collaboration which set and enforce high learning and behavioral standards and convey the message that all student can learn?
2. Does the school present norms, activities, programs and policies that demonstrate a caring community for students?
3. Are all students taught ongoing life skills through activities and programs?
4. Does the school articulate programs and strategies for connectedness and meaningful contributions to the school and community?

19 Section V: STUDENT SUCCESS TEAMS (SST):

SST-4. The School Makes a Compelling Case: (a). All meetings include the parent, the student, the requesting teacher(s), the administrator or designee and appropriate personnel. (b) Student strengths are listed, the intervention plan has a positive focus and is almost always based upon those strengths. (c) State recommended forms are always used. (d) All forms are legible and complete. (e) SST protocols with follow-up meetings are completed for 35 or more different students. (f) All team members sign the SST protocol. Parent and student are present. (g) Responsibility for interventions is equally shared by parents, student and a variety of school staff members. (h) Dates and persons responsible for each action are clearly listed with a specific follow-up date given. (i) Timely follow-up meetings are held for every initial SST and are attached to the initial meeting protocol. (j) While not all follow-up protocols show positive outcomes, a pattern of successful interventions is evident for most students. (k) A prioritized, concise list of 2 or 3 specific concerns is listed. (l) Interpreters and written translations for the parent are provided when students/parents are not proficient in English. (m) Signatures indicate a variety of school personnel participated as a team. (n) A variety of brainstorming strategies are evident and based on student strengths.

SST 3. The School Makes a Strong Case. (a) More than half of the meetings include the parent, the student, and the required personnel. (b) Intervention plan is positively focused and generally based on student strengths. (c) State recommended forms are generally used. (d) Most forms are legible and complete. (e) SST protocols with follow-up meetings are completed for 25 or more different students. (f) Team members are listed on the SST protocol. Parent and student are usually present. (g) Responsibility for interventions is equally shared by parents, student and some staff members.

Instructions for Completing the M&M Application

| Page | Program Element |
|------|---|
| 19 | <p>Section V: STUDENT SUCCESS TEAMS (SST) (cont.):</p> <p>SST 3. The School Makes a Strong Case (cont). (h) Dates and persons responsible for each action are clearly listed with a follow-up date given. (i) Timely follow-up meetings are held for every initial SST and are attached to the initial meeting protocol. (j) While not all follow-up protocols show positive outcomes, a pattern of successful interventions is evident for many students. (k) A prioritized, concise list of 2 or 3 specific concerns is present. (l) Interpreters and translations are provided when students/parents are not proficient in English. (m) Most SST protocols indicate a variety of school personnel involved. (n) A variety of brainstorming strategies are evident on most protocols.</p> <p>SST-2 The School Makes a Sufficient Case. (a) Less than half of the meetings include the parent, the student, and the required personnel. (b) Most intervention plans have a positive focus and are based upon student strengths. (c) All elements of state recommended forms are present. (d) Many forms are legible and complete. (e) SST protocols with follow-up meetings are completed for 20 or more different students. (f) Team members are listed on the SST protocol. Parent and student attend more than half of the meetings. (g) The staff takes little responsibility for interventions; the student and parent or ORC are held almost exclusively responsible. (h) Not all dates or persons responsible for actions are present or specific follow-up dates are listed. (i) Timely follow-up meetings are held for most initial SST and are attached to the initial meeting protocol. (n) Action plan indicates that some brainstorming took place. (j) A clear pattern of successful interventions is not evident. (k) Concerns are listed but may not be prioritized or specific. (l) Some protocols indicate interpreters used and translations provided when students /parents are not proficient in English. (m) SST protocols indicate limited participation of school personnel involved in SST effort.</p> <p>SST-1. The School Makes a Seriously Limited Case. (a) Few meetings include the parent, the student, and the required personnel. (b) The meeting has a negative tone and the intervention plan is aimed at the parent and child. (c) State recommended forms/elements are not used. (d) Forms are not be filled out completely and/or are not legible. (e) There are less than 20 protocols and follow-ups for different students. (f) There is little evidence of consistent team membership, and parent or student is not usually present. (g) The staff takes little or no responsibility for interventions; the student and parents or ORC are held exclusively responsible. (h) Dates for actions and persons responsible are not listed . “ASAP” or “On-going” is listed rather than specific dates for actions to begin. (i) Timely follow-up meetings are rarely evident.</p> |

Instructions for Completing the M&M Application

Page

Program Element

19 Section V: STUDENT SUCCESS TEAMS (SST) (cont.):

SST-1. The School Makes a Seriously Limited Case.

(j) Many interventions are punitive, or immediate referrals to special ed programs or alternative schools. (k) Concerns are excessive or are not prioritized or specific. (l) Little or no evidence in the protocols that interpreters were used and few translations provided when students /parents are not proficient in English. (m) Little or no evidence of a variety of school personnel involved. (n) Little or no evidence that brainstorming took place.

Student Study Team Critical Elements

1. Are there an average of four SST meetings with follow-ups per month?
2. Is there sufficient evidence that the student's teachers, parents and student and other essential members were present on a consistent basis?
3. Do the "actions" and "responsibilities" sections of the SST minutes show that the school is taking an active and positive role?
4. In the follow-up documentation is there measurable evidence indicating student results in the "areas of concern"?
5. Is there evidence presented that the SST is being used as a positive, early intervention process for students facing attendance, attitude and/or academic problems?
6. In most cases were there a wide range of previous interventions attempted to address the areas of concern?

19 Section VI: STUDENT LEARNING LEVELS: Following directions in the application, schools must write a maximum of three-pages describing their assessment of the learning levels of those multifunded students listed on the state Standards-Based School Achievement Summary and the Academic Performance Index report forms, pages 22 & 23 in the competitive application, pages 20 & 21 in the non-competitive application.

SL-4. The School Makes a Compelling Case: (a) The school uses a weighted "multiple measures" system including performance indicators and the SAT 9 to determine if students are performing at grade level (b) The school presents a clear multiple year comparison of multi-funded and all students at sequential grade levels showing improvement. (c) A process was implemented to examine student learning data that included teachers and parents. (d) The school reported great improvement resulting from its review of student learning data. (e) SBSAS and API forms show significant academic improvement for the multifunded student group presented.

Instructions for Completing the M&M Application

| Page | Program Element |
|------|--|
| 19 | <p>SL-3. The School Makes a Strong Case. (a) The school uses a “multiple measures” system including the SAT 9 to determine if students are performing at grade level (b) The school presented a multiple year comparison of multifunded and all students at sequential grade levels. (c) A process was planned to examine student learning data that will include teachers and parents. (d) The school reported some improvements resulting from a review of its student learning data. (e) SBSA and API forms show some academic improvement for the multifunded student groups.</p> <p>SL-2. The School Makes a Sufficient Case: (a) The school uses something in addition to the SAT 9 to determine if students are performing at grade level (b) The school presented a single year comparison of multifunded and all students at one grade level. (c) While data does not reflect measurable improvement in the multifunded student groups, there is movement in that direction (staff development, rubrics, standards, pilots, etc.). (d) The school gave evidence that it looks at student learning findings. (e) SBSA and API forms show little academic improvement for the multifunded student groups.</p> <p>SL-1. The School Makes a Seriously Limited Case: (a) The school has no multiple assessment to determine if students are performing at grade level (b) The school does not present a comparison of multifunded and all students at one grade level. (c) There is no data presented that reflects any school effort at collecting and/or analyzing student learning findings for multifunded students. (d) There is no indication that the school is adopting alternative assessments. (e) SBSAS and API forms were not completed or show no or negative academic improvement for the multifunded student groups.</p> <p>Student Learning Critical Elements</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What “multiple measures” does the school use besides the SAT 9 to determine if students are performing at grade level? 2. Has the school developed a “weighting formula” of local or state standards, the SAT 9, and performance indicators to determine grade levels? 3. What alternative assessments does the school provide for Special Ed and ELL (English Language Learners) besides the SAT 9? 4. Is learning information provided for multiple testing years for the same class? 5. If standardized testing is not used, is there clear evidence that the school is using alternative assessments? 6. Does the school fully communicate the percentage of students meeting grade level standards to the staff, parents and community? 7. Is there evidence that school uses assessment data to inform classroom instruction? 8. Does the school list any improvements made to the program/service or specific student performance improvement that resulted from examining the data and making changes in the curriculum or classroom practice? |

Instructions for Completing the M&M Application

Page

Program Elements

22 Section VI: STUDENT LEARNING LEVELS:

Completing the 1999-2000 Standards-Based School Achievement Report and the Academic Performance Index report forms Schools must complete these report forms (pages 22 & 23 in the competitive application, pages 20 & 21 in the non-competitive application). The applications of the schools that do not include these learning findings forms will be **incomplete** and will not receive consideration for funding. Information. The Academic Performance Index report information is available from your district office or can be taken from CDE's website (www.cde.ca.gov)

Standards-Based School Achievement Summary compares the learning findings of reading and math for the multifunded student groups at one grade level with the learning findings of all the students at that same grade level. Eventually the school will have a multi-year data base from which they can draw inferences about the success of their learning program. Those involved in preparing this part of the application are asked to clarify the school's submission, to show that the school understands clearly how well students in categorically funded programs are doing. If the results are not satisfactory, the school should be revising its learning program.

Block A - Total School Summary

Enrollment

This asks for the total school enrollment at the end of the year. In this block schools should indicate which grade level was being examined.

Number Assessed

This is the number of students that were in the school at the grade level examined for a "full academic year" which is defined as being in the school since the first month of instruction. Students who have enrolled in the school since that time should be assessed, but their results need not be included in this report. The instructions asks for the total school enrollment—less the number of students who entered the school since the first month of the school year. While all students are normally assessed, the SB 65 M&M application asks the school to complete the data for all the multi-funded student groups listed and compare their progress against all the children in their grade level as a whole.

c. Meeting or Exceeding Grade Level Standards per Content Area Number: This is the number of students whose classroom work and assessment results meet the grade-level standards. For schools using SAT 9, this means the number of children at the 50 percentile or greater on that standardized test for that grade level.

b. Evaluated Number: This is the number of students who took the SAT 9 and other multiple measures. The number for the reading language and math areas may differ.

Instructions for Completing the M&M Application

Page

Program Element

22 Completing the 1999-00 Standards-Based School Achievement Report (SBSA) and the Academic Performance Index

d. Percent: This is the percent of all students at that grade level that met the district standards or reached or exceeded the 50 percentile, computed by dividing the number of students meeting the standards by the number assessed.

h. Average Percent: This is the average percent of all students, computed by dividing the number of students meeting the standards by the number assessed summarized across all grade levels in math and reading/language arts. Total Served This refers to the total number of multi-students who were served for any significant period of time during the year. It is not an unduplicated count, students that received services from several programs are to be included in the results for each of the programs. Since we are looking at one grade level sample, this total served would refer to the number served at that grade level.

Part B - Summary by Specially-Funded Programs

Title I/SCE-Targeted Assistance

This now refers to students in Targeted Assistance Schools who are served by IASA Title I funds, SCE funds or both. Schoolwide Program Improvement Schools are to check the small box entitled "SWP" in Part A, and leave this row blank. Since we are looking for a comparison with one multifunded group at a grade level as compared to the grade level as a whole, schools that are Schoolwide Projects may only use Title One students in this section.

Migrant Education

Include all students who have been certified as eligible for Migrant Education Services, whether or not they receive services. The general rule that you need only report the achievement of students enrolled in the school for an entire instructional year does not apply in the case of migrant students. All migrant students are to be reported here, regardless of length of enrollment in the school. Once again the sample group must be at least 30 students at the grade level examined.

English-Language Learners

Σ Redesignated English Learners R-FEP

All students who were originally identified as English Learners students and have been since Redesignated as Fluent English Proficient (R-FEP) are to be included here—whether or not they have received any services. Their progress in reading/language arts and mathematics is to be assessed in English.

Instructions for Completing the M&M Application

Page

Program Element

22 Completing the 1999-00 Standards-Based School Achievement Report (SBSA) and the Academic Performance Index (cont.)

Part B - Summary by Specially-Funded Programs (cont.)

Σ English Learners Language Arts and Math LEP Content

All LEP students are to be included here. Student with waivers enrolled in reading/language arts in their primary language should be assessed in the primary language. Students enrolled in mathematics in their primary language should be assessed in the primary language. English Learners not enrolled in reading/language arts and/or mathematics in their primary language should be assessed in English. Only the totals are to be reported in this section, not the results for each of the languages used in the assessments.

Σ English Learners-English Language Development

Although falling under the heading “Reading/Language Arts”, this cell actually calls for the assessment results of students’ progress in acquiring English in a class or classes of English Language Development (ELD). Assessments should measure students’ progress in meeting the district-established standards for each stage toward making the eventual program goal of full proficiency in English. The stages should be related to the length of time students have been studying in English. The percentage is the percentage of students who are making expected progress, for example, a student in the fourth year of the program who is functioning at the fourth stage level, according to the district’s language acquisition state/sequence definition or system, would be counted as meeting the standard.

Special Education

Students in special education can be considered to be in one of two categories for purposes of this report on the basis of the assessments they are administered. Since there are rarely 30 or more special education students at any one grade level, this category may have to be adapted for multiple grade levels and scores for multiple years adjusted.

Group 1.

Students participating in regular multiple assessments, with or without accommodations. All students in this category are assumed to be learning the core curriculum and participating in the district’s regular assessments. Most of these students should be able to show academic achievement in the district’s regular assessment process with no accommodations, or only minor accommodations in test administration.

As with student groups not in special education, results for these students are reported in terms of the number assessed who meet or exceed grade-level standards. Accommodations are changes in district academic testing procedures or format to allow students with disabilities to participate in test situations.

Instructions for Completing the M&M Application

| Page | Program Element |
|------|---|
| 22 | <p>Completing the 1999-00 Standards-Based School Achievement Report (SBSA) and the Academic Performance Index (cont.)</p> <p><u>Group 2.</u></p> <p>Students with severe disabilities participating in alternative assessments. Due to the severity of their disability, some special education students may be unable to participate in the district's regular multiple assessment process, either with or without accommodations.</p> <p><u>Gifted and Talented Education</u></p> <p>Districts should include all pupils identified as gifted and talented in the district in the 1999-00 school year, including any who chose not to participate in the GATE program. Gifted and talented students are defined in Education Code Section 52201 as possessing demonstrated or potential abilities that give evidence of light performance capability. As for those students reported in this category, there may be less than 30 at any particular grade level and the reporting will have to be adapted for multiple grade levels.</p> |
| 27 | <p>SectionVII: SCHOOL SITE COUNCIL: The School Site Council has responsibility for all school-based programs including the M&M program. A quorum of members must be present at least four meetings, must be elected by peers. The SSC represents all of the school community, approves the categorical budget, reviews and make suggestions to the educational plan, and approves the role of the outreach consultant.</p> <p>SSC-4. The School Makes a Compelling Case: (a) There are clear and accurate minutes from five or more regular meetings, with quorums, where at least 51% of members are present. (b) The SSC is legally constituted with parity between school and parent/student components. (c) All members actively participate in deliberations are accorded evident decision-making authority. (d) Evidence is presented that the SSC discussed and approved school categorical budgets. (e) The school approved a plan for supplementary and auxiliary services to multi-funded students. (f) The SSC reviewed the M&M program, including the role of the outreach consultant and approved the M&M application.</p> <p>SSC-3. The School Makes a Strong Case: (a) There are minutes from at least four regular meetings, with quorums, where at least 51% of members are present. (b) The SSC is legally constituted with parity between school and parent/student components. (c) All members actively participate in deliberations and are accorded decision-making authority. (d) Sufficient evidence is presented that the school categorical budgets are discussed and approved by the SSC. (e) The school provides a plan for supplementary and auxiliary services to multi-funded students. (f) The SSC minutes show that it reviewed the M&M program including the role of the outreach consultant and approved the M&M application.</p> |

Instructions for Completing the M&M Application

Page

Program Element

27 Section VII SCHOOL SITE COUNCIL (cont.)

SSC-2. The School Makes a Sufficient Case: (a) There are minutes from at least four regular meetings, not all with quorums, where at least 51% of members are present. (b) The SSC is legally constituted but some members may not attend all the meetings. (c) Not all members participate in deliberations or accorded decision-making authority. (d) There is no actual evidence that the school categorical budgets are discussed and approved by the SSC. (e) There is indication but no evidence presented to suggest that school prepares a plan for supplementary and auxiliary services for multi-funded students. (f) There is some discussion about the M&M program that included the role of the outreach consultant and the M&M application was presented to it.

SSC-1. The School Makes a Seriously Limited Case: (a) Minutes from four regular meetings, with quorums, where at least 51% of members were not submitted. (b) The SSC is not legally constituted and members may not attend most of the meetings. (c) Members do not actively participate in deliberations or are not accorded decision-making authority. (d) There is no evidence the SSC discussed and contributed to decisions regarding the school's categorical budgets. (e) There is no evidence presented to suggest that school prepares a plan for supplementary and auxiliary services for multi-funded students. (f) There is no evidence presented that the SSC discussed the goals of the M&M program and the role of the outreach consultant during the year.

School Site Council Critical Elements

1. Were there minutes for a minimum of four meetings for which there was a quorum?
2. Was it evident through a reading of the minutes that parents were taking an active role in deliberations and decisions?
3. Was it evident through a reading of the minutes that the following were discussed: categorical budget, School-Based Coordinated plan, and the goals of the M&M program and the role of the outreach consultant?

27 Section VIII: QUALITY INNOVATIVE AND PARENT PROGRAMS

All SB 65 Motivation and Maintenance Programs are School-Based Programs by virtue of the legal statutes initiating the program. The legal requirements of the School-Based Coordination Act (1981) apply to the Motivation and Maintenance Programs. As has been noted in this document, the school must have a school plan for auxiliary and supplemental services for the Title 1, Special Education, Bilingual or English Language Learners and identified. Gifted and Talented students. This articulated plan to improve student services at the school, including those for parents and special student populations. The narrative describes the services of the school that have directly impacted parents and students over and above the regular school program.

Instructions for Completing the M&M Application

Page

Program Element

27 Section VIII: QUALITY INNOVATIVE AND PARENT PROGRAMS (cont).

IV-4. The School Makes a Compelling Case: (a) The school actively initiates specific programs/services for students and parents and trains staff so that these programs produced verifiable improvements in student performance (b) The School provides effective support systems for the needs of other school populations (e.g., pregnant and parenting teens, disabled, abused children, etc.). (c) Parents have active input into programs designed for their needs. (d) The school shows abundant quantifiable, demonstrable evidence that the programs identified have accounted for positive student improvement in student attendance, attitude and achievement.

IV-3. The School Makes a Strong Case: (a) The school has initiated some programs/services for students and parents that have produced improvements in student performance. (b) The school directs effective supplementary support systems at the needs of other school populations (e.g., pregnant and parenting teens, disabled, abused children, etc.). (c) Parents have active input into programs designed for their needs. (d) The school shows some quantifiable, demonstrable evidence that the programs identified have accounted for positive student improvement in student attendance, attitude and achievement.

IV-2. The School Makes a Sufficient Case: (a) There are programs/services in place that address the needs of parents and special populations to foster improvement in student attendance, attitude, and/or achievement. (b) Effective supplementary support systems were planned for the needs of other school populations (e.g., pregnant and parenting teens, disabled, abused children, etc.). (c) Parents have programs designed for their needs. (d) The school claims that the programs identified have accounted for positive student improvement in student attendance, attitude and achievement.

IV-1. The School Makes a Seriously Limited: (a) No innovative programs/services are evidenced related to special needs students and parents. (b) No special or supplementary support systems were directed at the needs of other school populations (e.g., pregnant and parenting teens, disabled, abused children, etc.). (c) Parents have no special programs designed for their needs. (d) The school shows no evidence that the programs identified have accounted for positive student improvement in student attendance, attitude and achievement.

Instructions for Completing the M&M Application

| Page | Program Element |
|------|-----------------|
|------|-----------------|

27 Section VIII: QUALITY INNOVATIVE AND PARENT PROGRAMS (cont).

Critical Elements of Innovative Programs

1. Does the school list specific programs/services by title or purpose with a clear description of how the program works?
2. Can the school cite examples of individual student progress or statistical evidence of increased group performance as a direct result of an innovative program/service at the school?
3. Does the school identify parental involvement programs/services; list specific goals, strategies and services; and record positive results?
4. Does the school describe programs/services for students in at-risk situations which may include other student populations not specifically mentioned in the M&M guidelines?

Notice to Readers:

The rubrics are an unofficial supplement to the competitive and non-competitive M&M applications. The applications themselves have sufficient explanatory detail to assist the preparers of the M&M applications. Schools are not required or expected to consult this document. It is offered simply as a tool for self evaluation and study. If you have any suggestions for improving this document please call Marco Orlando at (916) 323-2212.